MAIL STOP ISSUE FEE
PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICANT:	Shiann Liou
APPL. NO.:	10/051,965
Conf.:	1558
Art Unit:	2827
Examiner:	Thai, Luan C.
FILED:	January 16, 2002
FOR:	SEMICONDUCTOR DEVICE POWER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM AND METHOD
Attorney Docket:	MP0116

MAIL STOP ISSUE FEE
COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. BOX 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

February 18, 2004

COMMENTS ON REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Sir:

In reply to the Notice of Allowance mailed November 19, 2003, the following comments are submitted in connection with the above-identified application.

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 and 25-40 remain allowed in connection with the present application.

In the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance, the Examiner quotes a limitation of independent claim 1, but references both claims 1 and 29; and quotes a limitation of claim 9, but references both claims 9 and 35. Instead of limiting the first statement to only claim 1 and

instead of limiting the second statement to only claim 9, the Examiner applies the first statement equally to each of independent claims 1 and 29; and applies the second statement equally to each of claims 9 and 35. Applicant submits these comments to ensure that claims 29 and 35 are not in any way limited by the Examiner's statement of reasons for allowance, which uses only claim limitations of claims 1 and 9, respectively.

While Applicant agrees that each of independent claims 1, 9, 29 and 35 distinguish from the prior art and are allowable over the art of record, each of independent claims 1, 9, 29 and 35 should be interpreted only by the limitations present therein. Applicant's do not dispute the fact that the prior art fails to teach or suggest the limitation of "a first bond pad...located in an internal portion of the semiconductor die", as indicated by the Examiner. But such a limitation is present in only claim 1, not in claims 1 **and 29** as alleged by the Examiner. Further, Applicant's do not dispute the fact that the prior art fails to teach or suggest the limitation of "a first electrical termination means... located in an internal portion of the semiconductor die", as indicated by the Examiner. But such as limitation is present in only claim 9, not in claims 9 **and 35** as alleged by the Examiner. Thus, claims 29 and 35 should not be interpreted as requiring any of the language quoted by the Examiner since this language does not address any limitations present in any of independent claims 29 and 35. Accordingly, these Comments are submitted herewith to ensure that each of independent claims 29 and 35, and each of the claims dependent thereon, are not limited by the Examiner's statements in any way and are limited only by the limitations present therein.

Applicant's claims should be limited only by the terms utilized therein. Thus, Applicant hereby submits these Comments on the Examiner's Reasons for Allowance in an effort to ensure

that the claims are properly construed based only upon limitations present therein and/or to ensure that the claims are not interpreted so as to include any additional claim limitations.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Donald J. Daley, Reg. No. 34,313 at 703-668-8000.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By _____
Donald J. Daley, Reg. No. 34,313
Attorney for Applicant

Please address all correspondence to:

MARVELL SEMICONDUCTOR, INC.
Intellectual Property Department
700- First Avenue, MS #509
Sunnyvale, CA 94089